

Office of the Attorney General
555 East Washington Avenue, Suite 3900
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101-1068

ADAM PAUL LAXALT
Attorney General
CAROLINE BATEMAN
Deputy Attorney General
Nevada Bar No. 12281
Bureau of Litigation
Public Safety Division
555 E. Washington Ave., Ste. 3900
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Telephone: (702) 486-2625
Facsimile: (702) 486-3773
Email: cbateman@ag.nv.gov

*Attorneys for Defendants
James Cox, Minor Adams, Sheryl Foster,
Brian Williams, Jo Gentry, Johnny Youngblood,
Brian Henley, Jennifer Nash, Dwight Neven,
Isidro Baca, Richard Snyder, James Stogner,
Jason Yelle, Francis Dreesen, Julio Calderin,
Wes Mattice and Gregory Smith*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

RANDY JOHNSON,
Plaintiff,

vs.

JAMES COX, et al.,
Defendants.

NJK

Case No.: 2:14-cv-01326-JCM-NJK

Order granting

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT
(FIRST REQUEST)**

Defendants, James Cox, Minor Adams, Sheryl Foster, Brian Williams, Jo Gentry,
Johnny Youngblood, Brian Henley, Jennifer Nash, Dwight Neven, Isidro Baca, Richard
Snyder, James Stogner, Jason Yelle, Francis Dreesen, Julio Calderin, Wes Mattice and
Gregory Smith, by and through counsel, Adam Paul Laxalt, Attorney General, and Caroline
Bateman, Deputy Attorney General, of the State of Nevada, Office of the Attorney General,

///

///

hereby move for an extension of time for the filing of dispositive motions pursuant to Local Rule 6 and Local Rule 26-4.

DATED this 25th day of August, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

ADAM PAUL LAXALT
Attorney General

By: /s/ Caroline Bateman

CAROLINE BATEMAN

Deputy Attorney General

Attorneys for Defendants

*James Cox, Minor Adams, Sheryl Foster,
Brian Williams, Jo Gentry, Johnny
Youngblood, Brian Henley, Jennifer Nash,
Dwight Neven, Isidro Baca, Richard Snyder,
James Stogner, Jason Yelle, Francis Dreesen,
Julio Calderin, Wes Mattice and Gregory
Smith*

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff Randy Johnson ("Plaintiff") commenced this suit with the filing of a Civil Rights Complaint on November 14, 2014. Dkt. #5. Pursuant to screening, the Court determined that Plaintiff stated viable claims for the following: violations of free exercise of religion; violations of equal protection; retaliation; and violations of the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act ("RLUIPA"). Dkt. #7.

On January 6, 2015, the Court referred the case to the Inmate Early Mediation Program. Dkt. #9. On February 20, 2015, the parties engaged in the Early Mediation Conference but did not reach a settlement. Dkt. #10.

On May 1, 2015, Defendants filed their Answer to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint. Dkt. #15.

On May 4, 2015, the Court issued its Scheduling Order. Dkt. #15. The Scheduling Order set the deadline for motions for summary judgment for September 1, 2015. Dkt. #15.

1 Defendants now move for an extension of time to file their motion for summary
2 judgment.

3 II. LEGAL ANALYSIS

4 The Court has broad discretion in supervising the pretrial phase of litigation, which
5 includes establishing discovery deadlines. See *Zivkovic v. S. Cal. Edison Co.*, 302 F.3d 1080,
6 1087 (9th Cir. 2002). LR 6-1 governs requests for extensions of time and it requires the
7 following: “every motion or stipulation to extend time shall inform the Court of any previous
8 extensions granted and state the reasons for the extension requested.” LR 26-4, which
9 governs extensions of scheduled deadlines, further requires that motions or stipulations to
10 extend deadlines must be supported by a showing of “good cause” and requests to extend
11 deadlines that are filed less than twenty-one (21) days before the expiration of said deadlines
12 must be supported by a showing of excusable neglect.

13 Defendants respectfully request that this Court find that they have demonstrated both
14 good cause for their requested extension and excusable neglect for their late submission.

15 III. REQUESTED EXTENSION AND GOOD CAUSE THEREFOR

16 A. Discovery Completed

17 Defendants have been actively compiling documents and other discovery in the present
18 case. Plaintiff has not requested any discovery as of the date of the filing of this motion.

19 B. Discovery remaining to be Completed

20 Discovery is currently closed. There is no outstanding discovery pending for any of the
21 parties.

22 C. Good Cause Explanation for the Request of an Extension

23 The Public Safety Division of the Office of the Attorney General, which represents the
24 Nevada Department of Corrections, has recently seen the departure of its three Senior
25 Deputies Attorney General as well as one general Deputy Attorney General. Undersigned
26 counsel for Defendants has absorbed twelve cases previously handled by the departed
27 deputies and is working to familiarize herself with the status of those cases while also
28

1 managing over thirty other cases¹. The present case involves numerous, complicated claims
2 against seventeen defendants. Counsel is in the process of reviewing Plaintiff's claims with
3 the defendants and has requested additional documents from the Nevada Department of
4 Corrections to include in a motion for summary judgment. Finally, counsel for Defendants will
5 be out of the jurisdiction from August 27, 2015 to September 1, 2015.

6
7 **D. The Present Motion for Enlargement of Time was not Submitted within 21 Days**
8 **before the Expiration of the Discovery Deadline due to Excusable Neglect.**

9 Motions for Summary Judgment are currently due on September 1, 2015. Defendants
10 were aware of the dispositive motion deadline in the present case and were actively preparing
11 their Motion for Summary Judgment by compiling records and obtaining declarations from
12 pertinent actors to the case. However, the departure of the three Senior Deputies within the
13 Public Safety Division of the Attorney General's Office took place within the last thirty days,
14 and Counsel's efforts to familiarize herself with their cases has delayed her ability to properly
15 present the motion for summary judgment in the present case. Counsel for Defendants
16 asserts that excusable neglect caused the request for an extension of time to be filed outside
17 the 21-day requirement of LR 26-4 and the Court's Scheduling Order and affirms that the
18 request for an extension of time is not for the purpose of delaying proceedings.

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 _____
28 ¹ A review of Counsel's assignments and appearances are detailed in Counsel's Declaration in Support of
Defendants' Motion for Extension of Time, attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Defendants respectfully request an extension of time to file their dispositive motion for a period of forty-five (45) days.

DATED this 25th day of August, 2015.


ADAM PAUL LAXALT
Attorney General

By: /s/ Caroline Bateman
CAROLINE BATEMAN
Deputy Attorney General

*Attorneys for Defendants
James Cox, Minor Adams, Sheryl Foster,
Brian Williams, Jo Gentry, Johnny
Youngblood, Brian Henley, Jennifer Nash,
Dwight Neven, Isidro Baca, Richard Snyder,
James Stogner, Jason Yelle, Francis Dreesen,
Julio Calderin, Wes Mattice and
Gregory Smith*

This motion to extend is hereby GRANTED. The deadline to file dispositive motions is extended to October 16, 2015. IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 26, 2015


United States Magistrate Judge